



AGENDA
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-SMALL

April 28, 2022 4:30 P.M. 2 GEORGE STREET

1. **Approval of Minutes from March 24, 2022, Meeting**

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Huey

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0
Gardner Absent

Executive Session

Board goes into executive session for purpose of reviewing legal memorandum regarding Board purview North of Line Street.

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Martin

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

(Glen Gardner arrives.)

Executive session concludes at 5:05pm.

2. **376 Race Street - - TMS # 460-04-01-062**

BAR2022-000743

Requesting replacement of metal roof with shingles at rear cottage, appeal of board decision.

Not Rated | Westside | c. 1930 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview

Owner: Jonathan Karch

Applicant: Jonathan Karch

MOTION: Denial of the appeal

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Wilson

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- Finer points of the ordinance are quirky but helpful in this case, including language that defines demolition as “removal of...if lost...of the structure.” Aerial shows how many metal roofs in this neighborhood, and it would be painful to lose that material in that location.
- In agreement. Roof is significant architecturally and it is historical. Demolition is a permanent loss of the feature.
- Agree, have looked at this from public right-of-way, the painted standing seam roof is absolutely character-defining and I don't support its removal.
- Agree with fellow board members. Specific language of the ordinance defines demolition as the loss of historic features.
- Recognize that it needs a high level of repair but the materiality in this context on this building is important to Charleston.
- Suggest working with Staff on extent of any needed repairs.

3. **87½ Warren Street - - TMS # 460-16-01-100**

BAR2022-000744

Requesting replacement of slate roof with standing seam metal.

Category 4 | Radcliffeborough | c. 1905-1915 | Old and Historic District

Owner: William Wilson

Applicant: William Wilson

MOTION: Denial

MADE BY: Wilson SECOND: Martin

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

PREVIOUS MOTION 3.10.22: Deferral to allow the applicant to seek evidence that the original roof material was not slate.

PREVIOUS Staff Comments 3.10.22:

1. *The applicant states that the existing slate roof is non-original to the structure. Staff has found no record of a roof replacement in the BAR files.*

- 2. *The failure is not substantiated by a structural report.*
- 3. *Slate is a significant roofing material within the historic districts and should be repaired and retained.*

Staff Comments:

- 1. Staff’s policy, comments, and recommendation haven’t changed from the previous meeting, and per our policy standard, historic fabric should be retained and repaired or replaced in-kind.
- 2. Additionally, a roof permit from March 12, 1990 was found which states “reroofing no change” which therefore implies that slate was and has been on the house continuously.

Staff Recommendation: Denial

NOTES:

- Board member asks Applicant as to his opposition to replacement. Applicant responds that this is due to cost of \$65,000.
- Date of survey card is 1985, and card photograph indicates a shingle/tile shape, ridge cap, and guttering system which would be typical for a masonry building. Don’t see evidence that the roof hasn’t been slate. Building permit from 1990 indicates that roof was replaced with the same material – material on 1985 card. See nothing to the contrary
- Regarding existing roof, there may be confusion on the survey card as to material, but photo clearly shows it was not a standing seam metal.
- Doesn’t make sense that a slate roof would have replaced a lesser material, in 1990.
- Minor errors on survey cards can exist, but photo on card speaks louder than words. Less
- Seems unlikely that a historic metal roof would have been replaced with slate. More evidence that there was a slate roof. Composite did not exist when the house was built in 1905.
- Regarding context and materials, the variety is what’s important. Losing that in the vicinity would be regretful.

4. **497 Huger Street - - TMS # 460-02-04-076** **BAR2022-000774**

Request replacement of metal roof.
 Category 3 | Hampton Park Terrace | c. 1915 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview
 Owner: Christian Kendall
 Applicant: Jordan Dickens (presented by Shawn Otis)

MOTION: Denial of demolition

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Gardner VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

- 1. Hand-crimped metal roofs are a character-defining feature of various historic houses and structures throughout the Peninsula.
- 2. The Policy Statement on Charleston Standards encourages property owners to retain and repair historic fabric rather than replace it. Furthermore, the policy states, “When deterioration is so severe that replacement is necessary, the new feature should match the old in design, color, textures, and where possible, materials.”
- 3. While we do not have jurisdiction over the new roof, the applicant’s proposal does comply with BAR standards for replacing in kind.

Staff Recommendation: Final Approval

NOTES:

- Board member seeks clarification on proposed replacement material – manually crimped, painted, factory finish.
- Applicant should provide additional photos of the damage to ascertain. Am opposed to tion of the fabric as a loss of character of this building. Comfortable with Staff guiding Applicant through an in-kind replacement and repair.
- Agree with fellow Board Member in viewing the definition of demolition as the loss, in lieu of a replacement in-kind. Important to differentiate.
- Encourage repair, such as utilizing a replacement in-kind.

5. **1137 Morrison Drive - - TMS # 461-09-01-011** **BAR2022-000775**

Request alteration to pole sign for new reverse lit channel letters.
 Not Rated | North Central | Historic Materials Demolition Purview

Owner: John and Brenda Haire
Applicant: Brooks Signs, Jonathan Alcon

MOTION: Approval

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Huey VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

BAR-L Staff Comments 4.27.22:

1. Certain parts of the Historic Corridor District are experiencing significant new growth.
2. This growth is creating a rapid influx of proposed signage which is not directly addressed in the Sign Policy Statements. Most are asking for signage types which we would normally have to Deny based on the existing language of the General Sign Policy Statement.
3. Denial of these submittals may result in appeals possibly resulting in a number of these signage submittals coming before the Board on a regular basis.
4. The advent of new lighting technologies coupled with an evolving architectural language of in some of these areas can be compatible and appropriate but must be reviewed carefully on a case-by-case basis.
5. Overly bright, jarring, or garish colors or designs are to be strongly avoided with only signage which complements the building and its' context being allowed.
6. As an internal check, any illuminated signage should be reviewed and approved by the City Architect before an Approval is entered into the City's Data Management System by Staff.

BAR-L Staff Recommendation 4.27.22:

Approval for amended language to the General Sign Policy Statement to include the Historic Corridor District and the allowance for additional types of signage and the illumination thereof, on a case-by-case basis.

Alternatively, if the Board Defers, Denies or fails to act on this Agenda item, the signage submittal for 997 Morrison Dr. (CTC) should be heard, as they have been waiting a long time for a decision on their signage request which would be Denied by Staff under the current General Sign Policy Statement.

Staff Observations:

1. The current sign is legal, non-conforming.
2. If the current sign is changed structurally, it must be brought into compliance, which allows a monument sign rather than pole sign.
3. If the current sign was simply refaced (no structural changes) it could remain the current size.

Staff Comments:

1. Staff has no issue with the reduction in size.
2. The lighting is appropriate for the location and use.

Staff Recommendation: Final Approval.

NOTES:

- No issue
- Agree its legal non-confirming which is why I asked. Reducing in size so problem but do agree that a policy statement would
- Enc a Morrison corridor policy for signage is warranted
- Staff rec is on target. Size reduction is an improvement and need a board discussion for this area. Is appropriate today though

6. 15 Bedons Alley - - TMS # 458-09-03-087

BAR2022-000776

Request conceptual approval for new construction of single family.

New | Charlestowne | Old and Historic District

Owner: Elizabeth Simmons

Applicant: Sebastian Von Marschall

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Staff comments and Board comment to study the window hierarchy and FRBS.

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Gardner VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. There appears to be a scale issue with the windows compared to the adjacent (left) property. Applicant to confirm size of standard window used.

- 2. Staff appreciates the use of detailing on the north wall to mitigate the flush solid wall but suggests further explanation or restudy for alternative methods or treatments.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with staff comments and final review by staff.

NOTES:

- Handsome building, and well detailed. Window comments regarding size and height could be remedied. No issue with portico - handsome feature with superb materiality. Will give a lighter feel than a full length piazza. Would like to see how drainage is addressed.
- Regarding height of first floor, Applicant indicates floor will be lowered due to stair restraints.
- Well detailed and handsome proposal.
- No concern on height/scale/mass.
- Appreciate PSC's comment and might be worth considering window hierarchy and portico comments as well as staff's comments regarding windows and north wall.

7. 13 E Battery Street - - TMS # 457-16-04-085 BAR2022-000777

Request reconstruction of the east portico, new drive, and pedestrian gates.
 Category 2 | Charlestowne | 1845 | Old and Historic District
 Owner: Ted and Christy Ray
 Applicant: Glenn Keyes Architects

MOTION: Final Approval

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Wilson VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Observations:

- 1. Staff's previous comments have been addressed.

Staff Recommendation: Final approval.

NOTES:

- Question for Applicant regarding phasing and fan window. App confirms that fan window is a deviation but allows light into the apartment. Applicant confirms roof material to be membrane terne roof.
- Great project.

8. 20 S Battery Street - - TMS # 457-16-02-052 BAR2022-000778

Request conceptual approval of wood balustrade at roof and reconstruction of wood brackets at attic balcony.
 Category 1 | Charlestowne | 1840 | Old and Historic District
 Owner: Charleston Properties South Battery, LLC
 Applicant: Glenn Keyes Architects

MOTION: Final Approval

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Huey VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

- 1. Revise new balusters to match the existing balusters on the lower piazzas.

Staff Recommendation: Final Approval.

NOTES:

- Applicant confirms material to be all wood.

9. 58 Laurens Street - - TMS # 458-01-01-018 BAR2022-000779

Requesting conceptual approval to change the configuration of front doors and windows, replacing the Juliet balcony.
 Not Rated | Ansonborough | 1940 | Old and Historic District
 Owner: Lesley Firestone & David Vyborny

Applicant: Laura Altman

MOTION: Deferral to restudy and preserve the character-defining features, particularly the fenestration at the front elevation, and a Board comment that painting this brick is discouraged.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: ?

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. Staff would prefer that the balcony engage with the columns, similar to how the original porch appeared, but this is an improvement from the existing with a nicer and more ornamental railing.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with final review by staff.

NOTES:

- Applicant confirms that brackets will be needed for the balcony for structural purposes, that visible material is a ledger board, that restoring original second story porch is not part of the scope of the project at this time, and that house was designed and built as a duplex.
- Confirm no landing required at top of stairway.
- Would lament the loss of the original duplex façade, as these were intentionally designed and were part of the peninsula.
- Painting of brick has been controversial on this Board.
- Appropriateness of painting on brick depends on the age of the brick. Structures of the 1940s are often in between – suburban or special brick? Needs to be looked at carefully.
- Must be careful with the erasing of history of this building while understanding the best use might be as a single family dwelling.
- In favor of preserving the look of the duplex to avoid confusion and to preserve history. Not opposed to proposal, but would encourage you to keep the existing configuration. Encourage restudy.
- Agree with fellow Board Members particularly regarding the 3-over-1 windows which are defining features. Duplex appearance is also a character-defining feature and would struggle with proposed changes at front. Juliet balcony structure will need significant support. Makes more sense to restore original porch. Can't support wholesale rearrangement of front façade.
- Lite patterns of the new doors are in contradiction to the windows. More harmony in the pattern of fenestration is warranted.
- Balcony is tricky but biggest concern is painted brick and rearrangement of front façade.
- No issue with Juliet balcony, not useful but perhaps not intended to be.
- Encouraged that house is getting love it needs and scope of work prudent to settle house into streetscape. Amount of fabric requested for change warrants restudy and reconsideration.
- Reversible field sample for brick paint could be an option for review.

Break

MOTION: Ten-minute break

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Huey

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

10. 6 Prioleau Street - - TMS # 458-09-04-075

BAR2022-000751

Request conceptual approval for construction of two single-family buildings on a vacant lot governed by Factors Walk PUD.

French Quarter | Old and Historic District
 Owner: Vanderking Capital
 Applicant: Amber Aument

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Staff comment 2 and Board comment to restudy ground level pedestrian experience, to lower the clear height of the ground floor to a maximum of 8 feet, and to restudy the Juliet balconies.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Wilson

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. The composition of each structure is busy, perhaps driven by program or perhaps driven by desire for visual interest on tall facades. Charleston architecture relies on simplicity in massing and rational repetitive fenestration. Because there is reduced visibility to a

portion of both proposed buildings, Staff has worked with the Applicant, and the Applicant has been responsive, on small tweaks on the most visible portions. Staff is relying upon the provided three-dimensional images to comprehend how the visible portion of each building will be viewed. With this, the massing is found to be sufficiently responsive to each open view corridor.

- 2. Consider any additional simplifications to the facades such as limiting the use of trim bands and bay extensions. Consider a different material for the base to mitigate the height. Staff suggests the ground floor be a projected base of the same brick material for the other floors. (Four floors is permissible in the Factor’s Walk PUD which governs this property.)
- 3. Regarding the garage doors facing Prioleau and Concord Streets, while typically not ideal, a study of the area reveals parking garages a block north and south of this property as well as screened but open parking beneath a building directly north on the same block. To implement garage access facing the street, Applicant must utilize minimally-sized single-bay highly upgraded garage doors.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

NOTES:

- Applicant confirms there are no design guidelines in the PUD, 2 and 4 Prioleau are outside of the PUD, chimneys to be smooth stucco on frame, and bay element which shows setback encroachment on A1.0 has been addressed.
- Clear that Applicant has thoughtful approach and given project a lot of attention, but also hear the concerns. Believe simplified fenestration and simplifying some of the decorative elements like the Juliet balconies would benefit the project. Height is probably appropriate for this location. Appreciate pulling back the top level. Could reduce the ground floor closer to 8’. Agree with applicant that roof terrace element has precedent in this area. Not particularly friendly for ground-floor pedestrian level experience and public realm. Otherwise, well considered and high quality.
- Ground floor could be lowered to 8’ based on FEMA and 2’ freeboard. Recess of garage doors is important. Complicated site. Height fits the context. Agree that fenestration and continuity needs restudy.
- Nice design.
- Treatment of garage doors is very important. Come down in height. Simplification of window patterns is due. Height/scale/mass is ok.

11. **698 Rutledge Avenue - - TMS # 463-05-04-070** **BAR2022-000780**

Request alteration to exterior stairs and porch enclosure, fenestration changes.
Category 4 | North Central | c. 1942 | Historic Corridor District
Owner: Ben Dallesandro
Applicant: AJ Architects

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Staff comment #1 and FRBS

MADE BY: Gardner SECOND: Huey VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Observations:

- 1. The stairs being altered are not visible and the appurtenance is minimally visible from public ROW.

Staff Comments:

- 1. The existing plans appear to show the newly proposed windows and additionally the octagonal outline of the newly proposed windows are depicted on the existing elevation. Applicant to confirm if this is an indication of the demolition for the windows or an indication that these were original on the elevation.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual Approval with staff and board comments and final review by staff.

NOTES:

- Didn’t even realize there was a tower; ready to see something come on this corner.
- Applicant confirms that intent of painted portion is to repaint. Fear removal will take the finish off the brick. Constantine building? No issue with proposal. will be positive for building and neighborhood. Agree with Staff and appreciate the application.

12. **11.5 St. Philip Street - - TMS # 457-04-03-112** **BAR2021-000678**

Request new construction of mixed-use building utilizing existing remnant walls of previous structure.

Not Rated | Harleston Village | c. 1915 | Old and Historic District

Owner: Colin Colbert/ CKC Properties LLC

Applicant: Ashley Jennings, AJ Architect

MOTION: Preliminary Approval with Staff comments and Board comment that approval of ground face block system still is pending Board review of 4'x4' mock-up.

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Martin VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Observations:

- 1. Material sample has been provided.

Staff Comments:

- 1. The glass brick/block on the north elevation should be further described.
- 2. Staff is not opposed to the circular window at the front elevation as the contemporary design of the new building provides a nice juxtaposition to the existing salvaged element. Additionally, the shape may reflect the arches found in the existing salvaged element. Staff does contemplate whether this window should be raised higher on the elevation to mitigate some of the solid wall above especially in light of what angle of visibility might exist. Staff suggest a study of this.
- 3. Applicant shall provide additional information on the proposed block texture, size, and finish.

Staff Recommendation: Preliminary Approval

NOTES:

- Regarding the circular window, in a way agree with HCF comment. However, it is a more modern building; round window is a good solution, better than square; matches the arches.
- Comfortable with the circular window.
- Something I don't like about the round window, but something needs to be there. Not sure what. Maybe it crowds the historic ruin?
- The round window could work but agree with Staff regarding its positioning – maybe raise it 12"? Centering it in the field might work better. The diameter is the width of the center pane below so makes sense. Block could work but will be difficult to see a field sample as part of a partial wall assembly with mortar as described to see if it has the monolithic appearance as intended. Reads as a CMU block wall, which is not the appearance of quality we want. Need to see in larger format. Other detailing is coming together. Larger overhang at roof will be a challenge.
- Echo previous Board Member. Would not aim towards the Mount Pleasant installation, as shared in images. A mock-up with mortar could be reviewed. Walls need to feel monolithic and not appear as a concrete block wall even though it is. Rest has progressed. Just have material concern.

13. **51 Chapel Street - - TMS # 459-13-01-071**

BAR2022-000781

Request replacement of ground floor columns and handrail, and restoration of second floor porch.

Category 3 | Garden District |c. 1890 | Old and Historic District

Owner: Marc Anderson

Applicant: Robbie Marty

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Board condition and FRBS with staff comments and a board comment that realignment of front columns to eliminate the awkward cantilevered condition.

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Martin VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Observations:

- 1. The fire stairs are not original to the house.
- 2. Staff appreciates the reestablishment of the second-floor porch. The details of the proposed columns and railing mimic those at 53 Chapel.

Staff Comments:

- 1. Balusters on piazza railing should be noted as nominal 2x2, not 1 1/2 x 1 1/2.

- 2. Provide construction details including eaves, trim, piazza screen and other details as necessary to show finished details of specific conditions with materials noted.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual Approval with final review by staff.

NOTES:

- Applaud this as good first step with hopefully more to come on this house. Request re-establishment of proper column alignment between floors. Work with Staff as needed on siding.
- A move towards proper restoration. Makes no sense to put money into cantilevered condition, as this should be fixed to match its sisters. Encourage a full reopening of the porch at the second floor back to its original configuration and matching the sister houses.

14. **23 Reid Street - - TMS # 459-09-03-030** **BAR2021-000389**

Request final approval for new construction of a single-family residence.

Not rated | East Side | Old City District

Owner: Dawn Limberg

Applicant: Clay Shackelford Architect

Deferred by Applicant

15. **57 Barre Street - - TMS # 457-02-04-088** **BAR2022-000782**

Request conceptual approval for new construction of a single-family residence.

Harleson Village | Old and Historic District

Owner: Bud Mann

Applicant: Joel Adrian

MOTION: Deferral for architectural direction with Staff comments and Board comment to restudy the stucco on frame or to provide more detail on the proposed system.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Huey VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. The most prominent portion of the proposed is the stair tower. Unfortunately the ground floor of this most prominent feature is treated to emulate a bay of the garage, overshadowing the entry. Restudy the elevation and associated massing.
2. The south elevation may be the most visible and this one consists of large stucco plans and joint work. Restudy this elevation.
3. There is no description or image of the proposed fencing and gates but, according to the first floor plan and site plan, this seems to be a large part of the front elevation, stretching from one corner of the house to the other. Provide information on these elements.
4. The mix of fenestration needs restudy. The palette consists of single or double-hung windows, small square and rectangular windows, an accent oval window, and mixed-width casement style French doors. Additionally the French doors offer only Juliet balcony railings. And then to complicate matters, these openings utilize shutters which may or may not operate with Juliet balcony railings. Charleston's architecture relies on uncomplicated rhythmic fenestration. Restudy.
5. While material and detailing pertain to preliminary review, general architectural direction falls under the conceptual review. The proposal does not depict a clear architectural direction or depict elements, such as eave treatment or roof material, that would push the project in one direction over another.
6. Window head trim should reflect the window beneath it. Shutter shape should also reflect the adjacent window. Revise the arched bands over any non-arched windows prior to preliminary review.

Staff Recommendation: Deferral with staff comments.

NOTES:

- Much discussion over stucco over frame.
- Not problematic for height/scale/mass. Could be detailed to respond to comments heard. Would be better if upper portion wasn't stucco with joints because detailing around

fenestration elements compounds issue. Wood exterior could break down the mass for more urban detailing with this form.

- Agree, height/scale/mass if fitting for location. Architectural detailing, window alignment, and materials to review at preliminary.
- Suggest providing streetscape context for submittal. This may be required.

16. 304 King Street - - TMS # 457-04-04-018

BAR2022-000783

Request conceptual approval of storefront alterations.

Category 4 | c. 1912 | Old and Historic District

Owner: Jack Braha

Applicant: Rocco DiLeo

~~MOTION: Deferral with Staff comments and Board comment that detailing from the door head of proposed storefront or approximate string line of arch all above be detailed in more of a painted wood which is indicative of the historic images and any branding or branding materials occur below that band with final details to staff.~~

~~MADE BY: Huey SECOND: x VOTE: FOR x AGAINST x~~

(Motion fails)

~~MOTION: Deferral with Staff comments and Board comment that detailing from the door head of proposed storefront or approximate string line of arch all above be detailed in more of a painted wood which is indicative of the historic images and any branding or branding materials occur below that band.~~

~~(CHECK THE VIDEO)~~

~~MADE BY: Huey SECOND: x VOTE: FOR x AGAINST x~~

(Motion fails)

MOTION: Deferral with Staff comments and Board comment to restudy the architectural direction and to incorporate branding in a more subtle way into a more timeless design.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Gardner VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. New storefront should be set back within, recessed from the arch similar to the current storefront.
2. The proposed façade and materials are a very informal insertion into a formal façade. The arrangement of elements should be restudied for better balance.
3. Roll up doors, which are depicted in the wall section, will not be permitted.

Staff Recommendation: Deferral for upgrades, either in material or fenestration patterns, to the inserted front façade.

NOTES:

- A large façade in play but aesthetics are contained within an archway. Natural wood finish, as part of the branding, carried up into the archway is overpowering. Maybe permissible up to spring point of arch? Upper part needs to be restudied so that the work done for the upper work stays no matter the tenant.
- Archway is the dominant force. All of the rest to recede and not compete.
- Agree. Understand the desire of branding, but in historic context, everyone’s branding needs to be toned down.
- Could agree with the compromise approach at patron level. Not a problem with the wood and branding on the front.
- Could be a more timeless solution for the storefront. That doesn’t have to be demolished if store leaves.
- Concern is wood and barn finish. Materials are drawing attention away from historic building. Need to recess from. A different finish from barn wood and pine stain would sell tacos.

Motion to adjourn at 10:16